

ons which are necessary to overthrow a government. Does the United States dare take steps to aid the revolters?

Democracy is a fine system. We must keep democracy strong in the United States and in other democratic countries.

### The St. Paul Industrial Training School, Henderson County, Tex.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN DOWDY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article from the recent issue of the Dallas (Tex.) News. The article relates to concern St. Paul Industrial Training School. In truth, it is a brief life story of a wonderful couple, Prof. J. W. Smothers, and his wife, Alice, who many years ago committed themselves to the seemingly insurmountable task of building this school. With increasing hard work and complete dedication to the service of God and the children given to their care, their success is evidenced by the physical plant now existing; but an even greater monument to them is the more than 4,000 neglected Negro children, each of whom have made good citizens, who have been nurtured and taught by the Smothers.

The article follows:

**A LOT OF FAITH, HOPE, AND HARD WORK MADE  
ST. PAUL'S**

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

"St. Paul has been an all-Negro community since olden times. We want to keep it that way," said Mrs. Alice Smothers of St. Paul, Henderson County. "We want to live in our own backyard. And yet we want it to be a beautiful and comfortable and cultured backyard. We're not jawing and fighting and pushing and demanding things. We're working hard and praying hard. And we are getting things done. When we came here 35 years ago, St. Paul was a place of ignorance and misery and despair. The jungles of Africa weren't far away." Mrs. Smothers and her big, gentle, intelligent husband, J. W. Smothers, are cofounders of an incredible institution called St. Paul Industrial Training School. It is sometimes described in eastern Henderson County as a "Negro orphans home." This is a very poor description. For, with hard work, plenty of shrewd intelligence, and evangelistic zeal they have raised and educated around 4,000 underprivileged Negro children. They started with nothing, and they still don't have any money, but it would take \$1 million to replace the school's lands and buildings and equipment.

St. Paul is in sandy farmlands just to the north of Malakoff, a town named for a battleground of the Crimean War. St. Paul became a kind of battleground for Mr. and Mrs. Smothers when they came there 35 years ago from Alabama. He was a graduate of Hampton Institute in Virginia and was hired to teach agriculture at the miserable little St. Paul school. She was a high school graduate and the daughter of Dr. J. R. Wingfield, a trustee at Tuskegee Institute, the founder of a home and school for underprivileged Negro children and a Methodist college (Lomax-Hannon) back in Alabama. Alice, who has since earned a degree, was also hired to teach at St. Paul.

The couple from Alabama was distressed by their shack of a school. They pledged \$150 a month of their combined \$175 a month teaching salaries for an \$8,000 loan to build their own school and home for neglected Negro children. J. W. is a genius at farming. "No one can raise more corn on sandy uphill land," said one of his white neighbors. They raised most of their food "and scratched along on that \$25 for the rest."

Alice Smothers is a vibrant, fast-walking, fast-talking woman, a typical 1963 woman in many ways. And yet when her strong, sweet face was in repose, when she was listening, she seemed to me a model for what a sculptor would want if he were molding the face of some long-ago saint.

She has been the money raiser for St. Paul. Once when the school was about to close for the want of \$1,000 she went to Houston and walked for 10 miles "through a section of fine homes," knocking on doors and asking for contributions.

She was refused at all doors until she came to a big colonial mansion. "I'd asked the Lord for a friend," said Alice. She found one at the home of Mrs. Susan V. McAshan. "She had a beautiful dog and the dog loved me at first sight," said Alice Smothers. Mrs. McAshan, daughter of Will Clayton, wrote out a check for \$1,000 right then. Later, when they'd learned the true integrity that is back of the St. Paul School, Mrs. McAshan and her father gave \$20,000 toward a high school building.

"If it hadn't been for R. W. Fair of Tyler we'd have been finished at one time, too," said Alice Smothers. They were hauling their water. Mr. and Mrs. Fair put in a water system, and have done many other wonderful things for the school. Alice says she prays every night for everyone "who has even given a crumb to our school." She must pray for a long time. For the list of those who have helped St. Paul includes names such as Clint Murchison, Sr., Mrs. W. W. Fondren of Houston, the late William Fleming of Fort Worth, Harry W. Bass and Clyde H. Alexander and Paul Pewitt of Dallas, R. W. Knight and W. C. Strube of Corsicana, Mrs. Frances Bankston and LeRoy Kirby of Malakoff. There are too many names to fit into this space.

The Angus Wynnes, father and son, for instance, have been good friends. And there will be a "day" this summer for the Negro orphans at Six Flags Over Texas.

A tornado wiped out the school in December 1942. "We had five buildings by that time," said Alice. "J. W. and the kids got in wagons and followed the path of the cyclone and picked up everything they could including timber. They followed for 14 miles and then came back and built some shacks which did us for a spell until our white friends came to the rescue."

J. W. and Alice have five children of their own. "You might say the Lord has given us more than 4,000 other children. And all these have turned out well," said Alice. Six of the women teachers in the St. Paul School were raised by the Smothers. And to these 4,000, J. W. is "Big Daddy" and Alice is "Little Mamma."

### The Big Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD,

an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, entitled, "The Big Freedom."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE BIG FREEDOM

In response to a question on "Meet the Press" last night, Bobby Kennedy said yes, he believes in freedom of association; but when the questions got right down to the President's pending civil rights bill, it turned out that he doesn't believe in it very much.

This is important, because the doctrine of freedom of association offers the one remaining hope for a peaceful resolution of this racial crisis. If this ancient concept of personal liberty can be elevated to the status of other first amendment rights of free speech, free press, and free exercise of religion, a constitutional framework can be developed in which these formidable problems of race relations can be worked out. But if the freedom is lost, through want of fair understanding, the American Republic inevitably must move from one compulsion to another.

The "Jim Crow" laws of the South (and of many Northern States also) rested for many years on what was thought to be a secure foundation of constitutional law. So far as public institutions were concerned, the theory was that separate but equal accommodations did not violence to the 14th amendment. The Supreme Court repeatedly upheld that view. So far as private facilities were concerned—restaurants, movies, and the like—the theory was that the States had the right, through their police power, to reduce points of possible interracial friction and to give legal sanction to the prevailing social customs of the white majority.

Now these concepts have been swept away. No law that requires racial separation any longer is worth the paper it is written on. And for our own part, setting aside all 10th amendment arguments for the moment, we are willing to concede that such laws are wrong for this reason: They violate the principle of freedom of association. When the law says to a restaurant owner who may be entirely agreeable to serving Negroes, "You shall not serve Negroes," the law violates the owner's right of free association. When a State's judicial machinery is employed to prevent a man from selling or renting his property to a Negro, if he wants to, the same thing is true; a man's right to control and to dispose of his property is as precious as his right to engage in free speech.

The school segregation cases of 1954 started out on a wholly negative basis, pursuant to the 14th amendment. The Court said to the States and localities: "You must not segregate." Very well. But the vice of Mr. Kennedy's bill, and the growing evil of court decisions in this field, is that the whole thrust of the law is being reversed. From "you must not segregate" the courts move to "you must integrate." The soda fountain proprietor who once was told, "you may not" now is to be told, "you must." Under the President's plan, the businessman trades one compulsion for another.

One denial of freedom seems to us as bad as the other. If the owner of the Liberal Bar and Grill wants to serve both white and Negro patrons, that should be his right; but if the owners of the Jackson Ward Cafe or the Citizens Council Diner want to serve Negroes only, or whites only, this would seem to us to be their clear right as well.

Such a constitutional structure has freely movable walls. The breezes of social change can blow through it, but rights of privacy and personal taste may be preserved as well. Men are not compelled to act or not to act; they are free to respond voluntarily to whatever social and economic pressures may be applied.

The President's bill, so warmly defended by the Attorney General, would destroy such

freedom of association altogether. By its own terms, it would compel the owner of every soda fountain in the South, regardless of the nature of the community or the wishes of white customers who have provided all his business in the past, to admit unwelcome intruders to what often is a little neighborhood club. At this point, we cease to have free association; we have compulsory association; and in the enforcement of such compulsions, in the ironical name of freedom, we invite a tyranny instead.

### The People Must Speak

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, has produced an outstanding editorial column on the Supreme Court decision against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the schools. It is entitled "The People Must Speak" and is available for publication this week in newspapers across the country.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE PEOPLE MUST SPEAK

Your children in the public schools can never again recite the beautiful words of the Lord's Prayer nor hear the Bible read as they begin their day.

The Supreme Court has so ruled—and the Supreme Court, some say, now makes the law of the land.

The effect of the decisions of the Supreme Court last June and again this June regarding prayer and the reading of the Bible in the public schools is to move the United States toward the status of an officially godless nation.

To be sure, there always has been and always should be separation of church and state in America. But a proper separation of church and state should not be twisted to give atheism a veto over public recognition of the Almighty.

God cannot be kept from the public schools. Who will be cited for contempt? Will U.S. troops be sent? Will the National Guard be federalized? Are 2 atheists—and 8 supporters on the Supreme Court—to deprive nearly 40 million public school students of their heritage?

From the founding of the first public schools in this country, reading from the Bible has been an accepted practice. It has contributed to the moral character of generations of Americans. It has symbolized that ordinary men must obey not only the laws of their State and Nation but the higher law of God.

The Supreme Court has said that the U.S. Government should be neutral toward religion. That is about what the Soviet Government position is today. It is an officially godless state that permits some religious bodies to function. But religion as such is forbidden a place in public education or public ceremonial in Russia. That is the very position that the Supreme Court wants to adopt in and for America.

It should be realized that the decision rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court might have been rendered by a Russian court. Certainly, they in no way take into account the traditions of this country. The Declaration of Independence clearly states the author's trust in a "divine province." Again and again through all the state papers of our country and its Presidents and Governors is faith in Almighty God stressed as the cardinal principle of American life.

The thousands of churches that dot our landscape and dominate our cities, the dozens of seminaries, and the respect accorded religious observances, all characterize this Nation and people as religious in the deepest sense. America is a land of liberty because free citizens believe that their freedom is rooted in religious freedom and respect for God's will.

Now, after 186 years of national life, the Supreme Court wants to remove religion from our public life. The Court wants to stick religion behind church doors on Sunday. Isn't it strange that it took the Supreme Court 186 years to find out that religion in the public schools is unconstitutional?

President Kennedy said a year ago that the Supreme Court's decisions must be respected, no matter how much one may disagree with them. He urged more private prayer. But private prayer isn't the issue. Of course, we have a right to that; even people in Russia can pray in private. The issue is prayer in the hearing of our young people of this Nation. No, Americans cannot respect a decision that shows disrespect of religious faith—faith in God. When the Supreme Court strives to drive God out of the schools of the country, then it is time for the people and the Congress to take action to repudiate a ruling that outrages the deepest beliefs of generations of citizens.

The apathy, the lethargy, the resignation with which so many people, so many Members of Congress, even so many of the clergy have received these decisions are all indicative of the low moral state we have reached in this country. But it is not to be believed that this attitude is the will of the majority of people. There comes a time, when their leaders won't, that the people must act—and that time is now. If the Supreme Court won't listen and the administration won't listen—and we know by now that they won't—then Congress will, provided the people speak in a loud enough voice. And Congress can do something about it—if it will.

#### Diario las Americas

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

MR. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July is not only the anniversary of the independence of our great Nation. It also marks the 10th birthday of a newspaper which has become a force for unity and liberty throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The Spanish-language newspaper, *Diario las Americas*, started publication in Miami on July 4, 1953, a date purposely chosen to render tribute to the United States and the freedom and opportunity it affords its citizens.

*Diario las Americas* has constantly kept in mind the goals embodied in its mottoes:

"For a Better Understanding Between the Americas," and "For Liberty, Culture, and Hemispheric Solidarity."

Today, this newspaper is distributed in 21 capitals throughout the Western Hemisphere from Washington to Buenos Aires. Its stories and its factual presentations are trusted and its editorial opinions are valued. It has provided a factual window to the Western Hemisphere, in depth, in focus and with clarity and understanding.

Certainly, Latin Americans have a much better understanding of the difficulties their countries are facing, and the assistance we are attempting to provide, because of this excellent newspaper.

It has explained in great detail the dangers of Castro and communism in our hemisphere and has depicted the need for a philosophy of hope, rather than despair, throughout the Americas.

May I wish *Diario las Americas* a most happy anniversary and my commendations to Editor Francisco Aguirre and Director Horacio Aguirre for a most excellent daily chronicle of significant happenings in the Western Hemisphere.

#### Address by Hon. Jerry Voorhis Before the 17th General Assembly of the United World Federalists

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

MR. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 17th General Assembly of the United World Federalists held in Boston the last weekend in May.

As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, UWF is the respected bipartisan organization dedicated to the strengthening of the United Nations and to a world free from war under international law.

Our former colleague, Jerry Voorhis, was the Chairman of the Assembly and, of course, did his usual splendid job. At the close of the Assembly Mr. Voorhis made a few brief closing remarks, and it is my pleasure to include them below for the appreciation of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN, JERRY VOORHIS, BEFORE THE CLOSING PLENARY SESSION OF THE 17TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

Mankind as a whole has got to be able to speak and act in its own defense. Mankind as a whole has got to have authority to say to every nation and to all their science: "Thou shalt not kill man."

Hard to do? Yes. Ever been done before? No. Never before was it necessary for human survival.

Is it possible? It has to be because it is not only an answer but the only answer to man's stark peril.

Any precedent? Yes. Every human society that has survived has had to control violence and impose enough law upon its members to keep them from destroying each other.